

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

---

PAULA J. KARAS,

Civil No. 12-2388 (JRT/TNL)

Plaintiff,

v.

**REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

AVEDA CORPORATION,

Defendant.

---

This matter is before the undersigned United States Magistrate Judge on Plaintiff's application for leave to proceed in forma pauperis ("IFP"). (Docket No. 2.) Plaintiff is seeking IFP status pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915, so that she will not have to pay the filing fee and other costs associated with this action. The matter has been referred to this Court for report and recommendation under 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Rule 72.1. For the reasons discussed below, it is recommended that Plaintiff's IFP application be denied and that this action be dismissed.

An IFP application will be denied, and the action will be dismissed, when the plaintiff has filed a complaint that fails to state a claim on which relief may be granted. 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii); Atkinson v. Bohn, 91 F.3d 1127, 1128 (8th Cir. 1996) (per curiam).

To state an actionable claim for relief, a complaint must allege a set of specific historical facts, which, if proven true, would entitle the complainant to some legal recourse against the named defendant(s) based on some cognizable legal theory. Although federal courts must "view pro se pleadings liberally, such pleadings may not be merely conclusory: the complaint must allege facts, which if true, state a claim as a matter of law." Martin v.

Aubuchon, 623 F.2d 1282, 1286 (8th Cir. 1980). The facts supporting a plaintiff's claims must be clearly alleged. Federal courts are not required to "assume facts that are not alleged, just because an additional factual allegation would have formed a stronger complaint." Stone v. Harry, 364 F.3d 912, 915 (8th Cir. 2004).

In this case, the substantive allegations set forth in the complaint, repeated verbatim and in their entirety, are as follows:

"Now comes the plaintiff pro se in the above captioned matter and hereby attests to this United States District Court that the plaintiff's United States claims against the defendants is that the defendants violated the plaintiff's United States Amendment Rights under the United States Constitution to have to use hair products that are un pure and adulterated contrary to the United States code standards of the United States Food and Drug Administration. The injunctive relief sought in this case is motion for trial and the appointment of counsel under the forum and filing of Informa Pauperis."

(Complaint, p. 1.)

A complaint fails to state a cause of action if it does not allege "enough facts to state a claim to relief that is plausible on its face." Bell Atl. Corp. v. Twombly, 550 U.S. 544, 570 (2007). Plaintiff's current complaint does not meet this standard. The complaint does not describe any specific act or omission by the named Defendant that could entitle Plaintiff to any relief under any legal theory. Even with the liberal construction that is required in pro se cases, (Atkinson, 91 F.3d at 1129, citing Haines v. Kerner, 404 U.S. 519, 520-21 (1972) (per curiam)), Plaintiff's current complaint clearly fails to state any actionable claim for relief.

Because Plaintiff's complaint does not set forth a cause of action on which relief can be granted, her IFP application must be denied and this case must be summarily dismissed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii). Having determined that this action must be

summarily dismissed, the Court will further recommend that Plaintiff's anomalous motion entitled "Motion for Trial," (Docket No. 4), be summarily denied.

**RECOMMENDATION**

Based upon the foregoing and all of the files, records and proceedings herein,  
**IT IS HEREBY RECOMMENDED** that:

1. Plaintiff's application for leave to proceed in forma pauperis, (Docket No. 2), be **DENIED**;
2. Plaintiff's "Motion for Trial," (Docket No. 4), be **DENIED**; and
3. This action be summarily **DISMISSED** pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(ii).

Dated: September 26, 2012

s/ Tony N. Leung  
TONY N. LEUNG  
United States Magistrate Judge

Pursuant to Local Rule 72.2(b), any party may object to this Report and Recommendation by filing with the Clerk of Court and by serving upon all parties written objections that specifically identify the portions of the Report to which objections are made and the basis of each objection. This Report and Recommendation does not constitute an order or judgment from the District Court and it is therefore not directly appealable to the Circuit Court of Appeals. Written objections must be filed with the Court before **October 12, 2012**.